DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 681 SP 016 046

AUTHOR Woods, Doris G.; Danaher, Judith
TITLE A Conference on Promoting Faculty Involvement. Southeastern Teacher Corps Network (Tampa, FL, January 17-19, 1979).
INSTITUTION Southeastern Teacher Corps Network, Atlanta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Teacher Corps.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Cooperation; Higher Education; Information Dissemination; Information Networks; Institutional Characteristics; *Institutional Cooperation; Organizational Communication; *Staff Development; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

The Southeastern Teacher Corps Conference on Promoting Faculty Involvement spoke to the following issues: 1) Acquainting conference participants with the processes and problems of institutionalization; 2) Introducing participants to a variety of incentives and rewards useful to promote faculty involvement in field-based activities; 3) Demonstration of strategies for the enhancement of communication between institutions of higher education and local education agencies, for a more effective collaborative delivery of staff development; 4) Discussion of issues, concerns, and problems of the faculty of higher education institutions as they relate to Teacher Corps; 5) Demonstration of a model for planning staff development along Teacher Corps lines, at institutions of higher learning; 6) Acquiring techniques for verifying institutionalization; and, 7) Acquiring techniques for describing and analyzing organizational characteristics of colleges and/or departments of education. An evaluation of the conference by participants is included. (Authors/LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187681

Fac
~~79~~
40p
Av79

SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

A CONFERENCE ON PROMOTING FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 016046

January 17-19, 1979
International Inn
Tampa, Florida

MAY 1 6 1980

SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

Conference Report
Prepared by

Doris G. Woods

With the Assistance of
Judith Dansker

Produced by

SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
ATLANTA UNIVERSITY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

August, 1979

Burnett Joiner, Executive Secretary
Charlene Patrick, Administrative Assistant for Office Operations
Judith Dansker, Administrative Assistant for Documentation and Evaluation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	TABLES	i
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	CONFERENCE EVALUATION	5
III.	IMPLICATIONS	14

APPENDICES

A.	Conference Program	16
B.	Conference Evaluation Form	20
C.	Network Board of Directors	25
D.	Council of Deans	27
E.	Teacher Corps Washington Staff Contact Persons	29
F.	Task Force Planning Team	31
G.	List of Conference Participants	33

LIST OF TABLES

Number		Page
I.	Ratings of Participants on Conference Objectives	5
II.	Ratings of Participants on Individual Achievement of each Objective	6
III.	Ratings of Participants on Materials and Equipment	8
IV.	Ratings of Participants on Conference Facilities	9
V.	Ratings of Participants on Conference Leaders	10
VI.	Ratings of Participants on Conference Planning	11
VII.	Ratings of Participants on Individual Involvement	12
VIII.	Ratings of Participants on Instructional Strategies	13

1. INTRODUCTION

The Southeastern Teacher Corps Network is a regional organization of Teacher Corps projects which are located in the states of Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, and South Carolina. These projects represent cooperative educational efforts between twenty colleges and universities and fourteen local school districts (and their communities) designed to: (1) improve the educational opportunities available to children in areas where there are concentrations of low-income families; (2) encourage colleges and universities to broaden their teacher education programs; and (3) encourage higher education institutions and school districts to improve the quality of training and staff development activities offered to teachers, paraprofessionals, and other personnel. The Southeastern Teacher Corps Network was established by Teacher Corps Washington to serve as a support system and to provide needs-responsive assistance to local Teacher Corps projects in achieving their project objectives.

The director of each of the fourteen local Teacher Corps projects and the dean of the school or college of education for each of the participating institutions of higher education, comprise the Southeastern Teacher Corps Network Board of Directors and Council of Deans. These two groups provide operational direction to the Network in responding to the developmental and programmatic needs of local projects.

All directors and deans serve with equal authority to establish policy, plan specific activities, and approve the use of funds assigned directly to the Network to support mutually agreed to inter-project activities. The policies and decisions made by the Network Board of Directors and Council of Deans are subject to operational rules, regulations and policies issued by the coordinating funding agent, Atlanta University, and Teacher Corps Washington.

From January 17-19, 1979, the Network conducted a conference in Tampa, Florida at the International Inn on "Promoting Faculty Involvement." Thirty-five (35) representatives from the Network's fourteen (14) projects attended the program. The objectives of the program were to:

- Acquaint participants with the processes and problems of institutionalization;
- Introduce participants to a variety of incentives and rewards useful to promote faculty involvement in field-based activities;
- Demonstrate strategies for enhancing communication between institutions of higher education and local education agencies for a more effective collaborative delivery of staff development;
- Discuss the issues, concerns and problems of the faculty of higher education institutions as they relate to Teacher Corps;

- Demonstrate a model for planning staff development, along Teacher Corps lines, at institutions of higher education;
- Acquire techniques for verifying institutionalization; and
- Acquire techniques for describing and analyzing organizational characteristics of colleges and/or departments of education.

In an effort to achieve the conference objectives, Drs. Scott, Christian, Hansen, George, Joiner and the Network staff organized the following general sessions:

- Problems and Processes of Institutionalization
- Delivering Training in a Collaborative Mode
- Describing and Analyzing Organizational Characteristics
- Techniques for Promoting Faculty Involvement in Field-Based Activities
- Institutions of Higher Education Staff Development and Verifying Institutionalization
- Planning Staff Development
- IHE Staff Development/Case Studies
- Verifying Institutionalization

The following skill sessions were available for participants to choose from:

- Urban Training Model
- Rural Training Model (I)

- Rural Training Model (II)
- Using Persuasion Techniques
- Using Reward and Incentive Techniques

The presenters and facilitators were James Tanner, Wayne Pruitt, Eugene George, John Bullock, Edith Miller, Robert Scott, John Hansen, Norm Dodl, Don Orlosky, Huey Charlton, Charles Davis, Ralph Frick, Lou Carey, and Ann Wheeler. The conference program appears in Appendix A.

After the final session, conference participants completed an evaluation form containing a total of thirty-four (34) items: twenty-six (26) items required a rating by participants and eight (8) items were open-ended questions and recommendations. Areas rated were conference organization, presentation methods and participant interaction and involvement. With the open-ended questions and recommendations, participants could suggest future topics and thereby aid in the subsequent management and delivery of Network programs. A copy of the evaluation form appears in Appendix B.

II. CONFERENCE EVALUATION

In response to the questionnaire, twenty-one (21) of the thirty-five (35) participants rated the conference. A summary and analysis of the ratings and comments follow.

Conference Objectives

Items 1, 2 and 18 asked participants to rate the conference objectives on the basis of clarity and the degree to which the objectives were realistic. The scale ranged from STRONGLY DISAGREE (1) to STRONGLY AGREE (5). Table I contains the ratings of conference objectives. Responses are presented in frequencies and percentages.

TABLE I

Ratings of Participants on Conference Objectives

ITEM	– 1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
1. The goals/objectives of the program were clearly stated.	1(4%)	0	2(10%)	10(48%)	8(38%)	4.1
2. The goals/objectives of the program were realistic.	0	1(4%)	1(4%)	1(4%)	11(52%)	4.2
3. The conference objectives were realistic.	1(4%)	0	1(4%)	12(57%)	7(33%)	4.1

The mean rating of 4.1 in Table I would indicate that participants felt the objectives were clearly stated and realistic. This indication is further supported by the absence of recommendations in question 32 on the evaluation form and the inclusion

of positive, complimentary statements in question 32 regarding the objectives.

Additionally, participants were asked to rate the extent to which they achieved the seven conference objectives. A rating of 1 indicated that the objective was not achieved and a rating of 3 indicated that the objectives were fully achieved. Table II gives a summary and analysis of those responses.

TABLE II

Ratings of Participants on Individual Achievement of each Objective

OBJECTIVES	Not Achieved	Partially Achieved	Fully Achieved	MEAN
	1	2	3	
a. Acquired an understanding of the processes and problems of institutionalization	1(5%)	6(30%)	13(65%)	2.6
b. Exposed to a variety of incentives and rewards useful to promote faculty involvement in field-based activities	1(5%)	13(65%)	6(30%)	2.3
c. Exposed to techniques for describing and analyzing organizational characteristics of colleges and/or departments of education	2(15%)	5(38%)	6(46%)	2.5
d. Acquired techniques for verifying institutionalization	2(11%)	11(59%)	6(32%)	2.3
e. Built strategies to enhance communication between institutions of higher education and local education agencies for a more effective collaborative delivery of staff development	5(25%)	10(50%)	5(25%)	2.0

Table II continued

OBJECTIVES	Not Achieved	Partially Achieved	Fully Achieved	MEAN
f. Discussed the issues, concerns and problems of the faculty of higher education institutions as they relate to Teacher Corps	4(20%)	5(25%)	11(55%)	2.4
g. Exposed to a model for planning staff development, along Teacher Corps lines, at institutions of higher education	2(13%)	8(56%)	5(31%)	2.2

The conference was most successful in assisting the participants in acquiring an understanding of the processes and problems of institutionalization (objective a) and was least successful in demonstrating how to build strategies to enhance communications between institutions of higher education and local education agencies for a more effective collaborative delivery of staff development (objective e).

In general, participants felt that they had been successful in achieving the conference objectives. Significantly, no objective was rated as "not achieved" by more than five participants. Thus, the findings in Table I and II, coupled with the overwhelming responses to question 32, suggest that goals and objectives were successfully met, were realistic and clearly stated.

Materials and Equipment

In addition to evaluating the clarity and relevancy of conference objectives, participants were asked in items 3 and 4

to rate the effectiveness of printed materials and audio-visual equipment used in conference presentations. Table III gives a summary of the ratings of printed materials and audio-visual equipment.

TABLE III

Ratings of Participants on Materials and Equipment

ITEM	-1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
3. The printed materials were relevant, useful and clearly written.	1(4%)	1(4%)	2(10%)	9(43%)	8(38%)	4.0
4. The use of audio-visual materials and other support materials were adequate and effective	1(5%)	2(10%)	4(20%)	12(60%)	1(5%)	3.5

Responses indicate that the printed materials were more effective than the audio-visual and support materials in meeting the participants' needs. This conclusion is further substantiated by the unanimously favorable comments made in item 33.

Facilities

A fourth area evaluated by conference participants was the conference facilities. A summary and analysis follow.

TABLE IV

Ratings of Participants on
Conference Facilities

ITEM	-1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
5. The conference facilities and meeting space were comfortable, well-furnished and conducive to learning.	2(10%)	2(10%)	6(29%)	7(33%)	4(19%)	3.5
6. Rooms and on-site services were adequate for my needs	0	2(10%)	6(30%)	5(25%)	7(35%)	3.9

The 3.7 average of the mean score in Table IV suggests that conference facilities were not adequate for participants' needs. Responses to evaluation item 29, recommendations from participants on site/facilities, shed some light on the reasons for the somewhat low ratings. Among these reasons were poor temperature control in conference rooms, inadequate food selection and service, inoperative room features.

Conference Leaders

A sixth area evaluated by participants was the effectiveness and sensitivity of conference leaders. Items 7-10 asked participants to rate leaders and facilitators in areas mentioned. A summary and analysis of that data follow in Table V.

TABLE V

Ratings of Participants on Conference Leaders

ITEM	– 1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
7. Conference leaders and facilitators effectively assisted my learning experience.	1(5%)	0	4(19%)	8(38%)	9(43%)	4.3
8. Conference leaders and facilitators were sensitive and responsive to participants' needs.	1(5%)	0	2(9%)	12(54%)	7(32%)	4.3
9. Presenters were well-informed and had current information on their topics.	1(4%)	0	2(10%)	8(38%)	10(48%)	4.2
10. Presenters communicated their material effectively.	1(4%)	0	2(10%)	11(52%)	6(29%)	4.0

The average of the mean score of 4.2 would clearly indicate that the conference leaders had a positive impact on the conference. The presenters' sensitivity and responsiveness to the needs of the group are mentioned again by participants in item 30 which elicits the recommendations of the audience on instructors/facilitators. Most responses were positive. Specific recommendations were more participant involvement, more activities and less lectures.

Planning and Management

The sixth area of evaluation was conference planning and management. Items 11-14 asked participants to rate the

organization and scheduling of conference activities. Table VI gives a summary of those responses.

TABLE VI

Ratings of Participants on

Conference Planning and Management

ITEM	– 1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
11. Adequate time for discussion following presentations.	0	3(14%)	7(33%)	8(38%)	3(14%)	3.5
12. Ample opportunity to meet informally or socially with other participants.	1(4%)	0	1(4%)	6(29%)	13(62%)	4.3
13. Conference was well-organized.	1(4%)	0	3(14%)	3(14%)	14(67%)	4.4
14. The format of the conference added favorably to the program's effectiveness.	1(4%)	1(4%)	1(4%)	11(52%)	7(33%)	4.1

The overall response to conference organization was positive. Participants did, however, indicate a desire for more discussion time following the presentations. Again, comments and recommendations were consistent with numerical ratings. The comments, in the main, were positive.

Individual Involvement

Another area of concern was the extent to which participants felt they had been involved in and gained from conference activities. A summary of the responses to items 15, 16, 17 and 19 follow in Table VII.

TABLE VII

Ratings of Participants on

Individual Involvement

ITEM	– 1	2	3	4	5 +	MEAN
15. Active involvement as a participant.	1(5%)	3(14%)	4(18%)	6(27%)	7(32%)	3.9
16. Application of learning to local project.	1(4%)	0	2(10%)	7(33%)	11(52%)	4.3
17. I would recommend this conference to others.	1(4%)	1(4%)	0	9(43%)	10(48%)	4.2
19. I worked hard to achieve the objectives.	0	1(4%)	1(4%)	10(48%)	6(29%)	4.2

Significantly, the highest mean score was in the application of conference material to the local project. The fact that the lowest score was related to the participants' active involvement would be supported by comments suggesting more discussion and by item 11, Table VI (there was adequate time for discussion following presentations) which had a mean score of 3.5.

Instructional Strategies

Inextricably related to the foregoing areas are instructional strategies. In keeping with this idea, participants were asked to rate the effectiveness of the strategies used in conference presentations. A summary of that data is contained in Table VIII.

TABLE VIII

Ratings of Participants on Instructional Strategies

ITEM	1 Not Effective	2 Moderately Effective	3 Very Effective	MEAN
22. Lecture/ Presentation	1(5%)	9(43%)	10(52%)	2.5
23. Discussion	3(14%)	6(29%)	12(57%)	2.6
24. Skill/Session	1(5%)	7(33%)	13(62%)	2.6
25. Project Team Meetings	0	2(20%)	8(80%)	2.8
26. Film	4(50%)	1(13%)	3(37%)	1.9
27. Materials Display	5(31%)	8(50%)	3(19%)	1.9

Participants indicated the most effective instructional strategies were project team meetings, skill sessions, discussions and lecturing. Films and material displays were the least effective strategies.

Recommendations in item 34 suggested that presenters allow more time for mini-group discussions, react to real data from participants, and provide more time for input from participants.

III. IMPLICATIONS

Following a review of the data, it is evident that participants were positive about the general effectiveness of the conference program. In examining both ratings and comments, it is clear that the content, organization, and instructional processes were effective for and relevant to participants. Further, the ratings and comments allow one to draw useful inferences about the total effectiveness of the conference in an effort to enable persons at the Network level to better provide for the needs and interests of participants. Toward this end, some minor suggestions to improve future programs are:

- Audio-Visual material should be more carefully assessed for appropriateness and smoothness of operation;
- Greater inclusion of participants in sessions would promote a sense of involvement and increase mastery of objectives; and
- Select a site for convenience and comfort.

APPENDIX A

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Wednesday, January 17, 1979

8:00 - 8:30	Registration
8:30 - 12:00	Morning Session West International Room
	Problems and Processes of Institutionalization
	Dr. James Tanner Dr. Earnest Nicholson
12:00 - 1:30	L U N C H
1:30 - 4:45	Afternoon Session
	Skill Sessions
	Delivering Training in A Collaborative Mode
	Dr. U. Eugene George West International Room
Session I	Urban Training Model Dr. John Bullock
Session II	Rural Training Model Dr. Edith Miller
Session III	Rural Training Model Dr. Robert Scott

EACH SESSION WILL BE REPEATED

Thursday, January 18, 1979

9:00 - 12:00	Morning Session West International Room Describing and Analyzing Organizational Characteristics Dr. John Hansen
12:00 - 3:00	L U N C H
3:00 - 5:00	Afternoon Session Skill Sessions Techniques for Promoting Faculty Involvement in Field-Based Activities Dr. Robert Scott
Session I	Using Persuasion Techniques Dr. Norm Dodl
Session II	Using Reward and Incentive Techniques Dr. Don Orlosky

EACH SESSION WILL BE REPEATED

Friday, January 19, 1979

9:00 - 12:00	Morning Session West International Room
9:00 - 9:15	Institutions of Higher Education Staff Development and Verifying Institutionalization Dr. Mae Christian
9:15 - 9:45	Planning Staff Development Dr. Huey Charlton
9:45 - 11:45	Skill Sessions
Session I	IHE Staff Development Case Studies Dr. Charles Davis Dr. Ralph Frick
Session II	Verifying Institutionalization Dr. Lou Carey

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM

PARTICIPANT CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Role Group _____

So that we continually improve the quality of Network programming, we would appreciate your candid feedback on this evaluation. Please circle the number that indicates the extent of your agreement or disagreement with the statements below. Please answer every question. We thank you for your assistance.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Neutral, not sure
4 - Agree
5 - Strongly agree

1.	The goals/objectives of the program were clearly stated.	1 2 3 4 5
2.	The goals/objectives of the program were realistic.	1 2 3 4 5
3.	The printed material received during the conference was relevant, useful, and clearly written.	1 2 3 4 5
4.	The use of audio-visual equipment and other support materials was adequate and effective.	1 2 3 4 5
5.	The conference facilities and meeting space were comfortable, well-furnished and conducive to learning.	1 2 3 4 5
6.	Rooms and on-site services were adequate for my needs.	1 2 3 4 5
7.	Conference leaders and facilitators effectively assisted my learning experience.	1 2 3 4 5
8.	Conference leaders and facilitators were sensitive and responsive to participants' needs.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	Presenters were well-informed and had current information on their topic.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Presenters communicated their material effectively.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	There was adequate time for discussion following presentations.	1 2 3 4 5
12.	I had ample opportunities to meet informally or socially with other participants.	1 2 3 4 5

Conference Evaluation
Page 2

13. The conference was well-organized. 1 2 3 4 5

14. The format of the conference added favorably to the program effectiveness. 1 2 3 4 5

15. I was actively involved as a participant. 1 2 3 4 5

16. I can apply what I learned to my local project. 1 2 3 4 5

17. I would recommend this conference to others. 1 2 3 4 5

18. The conference objectives were realistic. 1 2 3 4 5

19. I worked hard to achieve the conference objectives. 1 2 3 4 5

20. If you were to attend a conference on the same topic again, what issues or topics would you like to have covered in the program?

21. If you were to attend another Network conference on a <u>different topic</u>, what topics would you like to have covered?

Please indicate the degree to which the instructional strategies used during the conference were effective.

1 - Not effective
2 - Moderately effective
3 - Very effective

22. Lecture/Presentation 1 2 3

23. Discussion 1 2 3

24. Skill/Session 1 2 3

25. Project team meetings 1 2 3

26. Film 1 2 3

27. Materials Display 1 2 3

Conference Evaluation
Page 3

Please indicate the degree to which you feel that you achieved the conference objectives.

1 - Not achieved
2 - Partially achieved
3 - Fully achieved

28. Objectives

a. Acquire an understanding of the processes and problems of institutionalization 1 2 3

b. Be exposed to a variety of incentives and rewards useful to promote faculty involvement in field-based activities. 1 2 3

c. Be exposed to techniques for describing and analyzing organizational characteristics of colleges and/or departments of education 1 2 3

d. Acquire techniques for verifying institutionalization 1 2 3

e. Build strategies to enhance communication between institutions of higher education and local education agencies for a more effective collaborative delivery of staff development 1 2 3

f. Have an opportunity to discuss the issues, concerns and problems of the faculty of higher education institutions as they relate to Teacher Corps 1 2 3

g. Be exposed to a model for planning staff development, along Teacher Corps lines, at institutions of higher education 1 2 3

RECOMMENDATIONS

Please list any changes or suggestions you have in the following areas:

29. Site/facilities

30. Instructors/facilitators

31. Conference Organization

32. Objectives

33. Materials

34. Instructional strategies

35. The most valuable aspect of the conference was:

36. The least valuable aspect of the conference was:

APPENDIX C

NETWORK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

NETWORK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Dr. Mae Christian

Dr. Willie Epps

Dr. Howard Fortney

Dr. U. Eugene George

Dr. John Hansen

Dr. Amos Issac

Dr. John Kampsnider

Dr. Suzanne Kinzer

Dr. Yvonne Luster

Dr. Edith Miller

Dr. Mark Richmond

Dr. Robert Scott

Dr. Marcy Szymanski

Dr. Elmer Tossie

APPENDIX D

COUNCIL OF DEANS

COUNCIL OF DEANS

Dr. Milton Baxter

Dr. Jack Blackburn

Dr. Nathaniel Boclair

Dr. Huey Charlton

Dr. B. E. Fancher

Dr. Jack Gant

Dr. Leon Lessinger

Dr. Evelyn Martin

Dr. Joseph Martin

Dr. William C. Moran

Dr. Andrew A. Robinson

Dr. Wayman Shiver, Jr.

Dr. David Smith

Dr. G. W. Sowards

Dr. Billy Williams

APPENDIX E

TEACHER CORPS WASHINGTON
STAFF CONTACT PERSONS

DR. WILLIAM SMITH, DIRECTOR
NATIONAL TEACHER CORPS PROJECT

MS. DIANE YOUNG, PROGRAM SPECIALIST
SOUTHEASTERN TEACHER CORPS NETWORK

APPENDIX F

TASK FORCE PLANNING TEAM

TASK FORCE PLANNING TEAM

for

A CONFERENCE ON

PROMOTING FACULTY INVOLVEMENT

Dr. Mae Christian

Dr. U. Eugene George

Dr. John Hansen

Dr. Burnett Joiner

Dr. Robert Scott

APPENDIX G

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Promoting Faculty Involvement

Tampa, Florida

January 17 - 19, 1979

PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS
Dr. Mae Christian Atlanta Consortium 2930 Forrest Hill Dr., S.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30315	Dr. Mae Christian Dr. Ralph Frick Dr. Charles Davis
Dr. Willie Epps Teacher Corps Mississippi Valley State University Department of Elementary Education Itta Bena, Miss.	Dr. Willie Epps Dr. Dorothy Leflore Mr. Ed King Mr. Leroy Robinson Mrs. Josephine Posey
Dr. Howard Fortney Teacher Corps P. O. Box 247 Eastaboga, Alabama 36260	Dr. Howard Fortney Dr. Arvis Harthern Dr. Frances Cannon
Dr. U. Eugene George College of Education University of South Carolina 503 South Main Columbia, South Carolina 29208	Dr. U. Eugene George Dr. Judith Joiner Dr. Keith Berkeley Dr. John Stevenson
Dr. John Hansen Teacher Corps Florida State University 403 Education Building Tallahassee, Florida 32301	Dr. John Hansen Dr. Bill Castine Dr. Ann Wheeler

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS
Dr. Amos Issac Teacher Corps Miles College Birmingham, Alabama 35208	Dr. Amos Issac Dr. Kevin Walsh Dr. Juanita Clarke
Dr. John Kampsnider Teacher Corps 514 N.W. 77th Street Miami, Florida 33150	Dr. John Kampsnider Ms. Sandra Woods Mr. George Morrison
Dr. Suzanne Kinzer Teacher Corps College of Education University of Florida Norman Hall Gainesville, Florida 32611	Dr. Suzanne Kinzer Ms. Kristy Wray Dr. Chris Kruger Ms. Faye Cake Dr. Marvin McMillan
Dr. Yvonne Luster Teacher Corps School of Education Alcorn State University Lorman, Miss. 39096	Dr. Yvonne Luster Dr. Fred Harris Ms. Hazel White Ms. Mary Holbrook Ms. Shirley Buck
Dr. Edith Miller Teacher Corps Auburn University 4032 Haley Center Auburn, Alabama 36830	Dr. Edith Miller Mrs. Lois Warner Dr. Dick Graves Dr. Nancy Loposer Mr. John Morgan Mr. John von Eschenbach
Dr. Mark Richmond Teacher Corps University of Southern Mississippi Southern Station Box 10005 Hattiesburg, Miss. 39401	Dr. Mark Richmond Ms. Eleanor Williams Dr. Bobby Moore Dr. Johnny Purvis Ms. Gwen Porter
Dr. Robert Scott Teacher Corps P. O. Drawer 829 Florence, S. C. 29503	Dr. Robert Scott Dr. Nick Nicholson Mr. Jerry Hough

LIST OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

PROJECT	PARTICIPANTS
Dr. Marcy Szymanski Teacher Corps University of West Florida Pensacola, Florida 32504	Dr. Marcy Szymanski Dr. Michael Barry Mr. Horatio Robinson Dr. Gordan Eade
Dr. Elmer Tossie Hastings Teacher Corps Project P. O. Box 487 Hastings, Fla. 32045	Dr. Elmer Tossie Mr. David Mosrie Ms. Roberta Katz

CONSULTANTS

Dr. John Bullock

Dr. Lou Carey

Dr. Huey Charlton

Dr. Mae Christian

Dr. Charles Davis

Dr. Norm Dodl

Dr. Ralph Frick

Dr. U. Eugene George

Dr. John Hansen

Dr. Edith Miller

Dr. Earnest Nicholson

Dr. Don Orlosky

Dr. Robert Scott

Dr. James Tanner

Dr. Ann Wheeler